



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

he conceives you as different, i. e. as a *practical* man; (3.) he exhorts you to change from your real state to the possible one which he conceives of (through the process of abstraction). The simplest act with design—that of going to dinner, for example—involves abstraction. If I raise my arm on purpose, I first abstract from its real position, and think it under another condition.

(f) But the chief point in all this is to mark how the mind frees itself from the untruth of abstraction. For it must be allowed that all abstractions are false. The isolation of that which is not sufficient for its own existence, (though as we have seen, a necessary constituent of the process of *knowing* and of *existing*), sets up an untruth as existent. Therefore the mind thinks this isolation only as a moment of a *negative unity*, (i. e. as an element of a process). This leads us to the consideration of mediation in the more general form, involved by the second question.

#### IMMEDIATE KNOWING.

(a) *Definition*.—"Immediate" is a predicate applied to what is directly through itself. The immediateness of anything is the phase that first presents itself. It is the undeveloped—an *oak* taken immediately is an *acorn*; man taken immediately is a child at birth.

(b) *Definition*.—"Mediation" signifies the process of realization. A *mediate* or *mediated* somewhat is what it is through another, or through a process.

(c) *Principle*.—Any concrete somewhat

exists through its relations to all else in the universe; hence all concrete somethings are *mediated*. "If a grain of sand were destroyed the universe would collapse."

(d) *Principle*.—An absolutely *immediate* somewhat would be a pure nothing, for the reason that no determination could belong to it, (for determination is negative, and hence mediation). Hence all immediateness must be phenomenal, or the result of abstraction from the concrete whole, and this, of course, exhibits the contradiction of an immediate which is mediated (a "*result*.")

(e) The solution of this contradiction is found in "self-determination," (as we have seen in former chapters). The self-determined is a mediated; it is *through the process* of determination; but is likewise an *immediate*, for it is its own mediation, and hence it is the beginning and end—it *begins with its result, and ends in its beginning*, and thus it is a circular process.

This is the great *aperçu* of all speculative philosophy.

(f) *Definition*.—Truth is the form of the Total, or that which actually exists.

(g) Hence a knowing of Truth must be a knowing of the self-determined, which is both immediate and mediate. This is a process or *system*. Therefore the knowing of it cannot be simply *immediate*, but must be in the form of a system. Thus the so-called "immediate intuition" is not a knowing of truth unless inconsistent with what it professes.

## THE PHILOSOPHY OF BAADER.

[The following letter from Dr. Franz Hoffmann to the St. Louis Philosophical Society has been handed us for publication. It gives us pleasure to lay before our readers so able a presentation of the claims of Baader, and we trust that some of our countrymen will be led by it to investigate the original sources herein referred to.]

We are requested to correct a mistatement that occurs in the first paragraph regarding the objects of the Philosophical Society. It was not founded for the special purpose of "studying German Philosophy from Kant to Hegel," although it has many members who are occupied chiefly in that field. The Society includes among its members advocates of widely differing systems, all, however, working in the spirit of the Preamble to the Constitution, which says: "The object of this Society is to encourage the study and development of Speculative Philosophy; to foster an application of its results to Art, Science, and Religion; and to establish a philosophical basis for the professions of Law, Medicine, Divinity, Politics, Education, Art, and Literature." We are indebted to Dr. A. Strothotte for the translation of the letter.—EDITOR.]

WÜRZBURG, Dec. 23, 1866.

Mr. President: In the first number of Vol. XLIX of the "*Zeitschrift für Philosophie*," published at Halle, in Prussia, edited by Fichte, Ulrici and Wirth, notice is taken of a philosophical society, organized at St. Louis, with the object of pursuing the study of German philosophy from Kant to Hegel.

This fact promises a correlation of philosophical movements between North America and Germany which is of great importance. I presume, however, that you have already been led, or that you will be led, to go back beyond Kant to the first traces of German philosophy, and proceed from Hegel to the present time.

Now, although a thorough and compre-

hensive view of Hegel's philosophy is in the first place to be recommended, yet the other directions in the movement of thought must not be lost sight of.

In the Berlin organ of the Philosophical Society of the Hegelians—*Der Gedanke*—edited by Michelet, may be found, as you perhaps know, an index of the works of Hegel's school, by Rosenkranz, whereas on the other hand the rich literature of the anti-Hegelian writers is nowhere met with in any degree of completeness. Many of them, however, are noticed in Fichte's journal, and in the more recent works on the history of philosophy, particularly in those of Erdmann, and still more in those of Ueberweg.

Among the prominent movements in philosophical thinking, during and after the time of Hegel, the profound utterances of a great and genial teacher, Franz Baader, reach a degree of prominence, even higher than is admitted by Erdmann and Ueberweg. This may be readily perceived by referring to the dissertation on Franz Baader, by Carl Philipp Fischer, of Erlangen, and still more by having recourse to Hamberger, Lutterbeck, and to my own writings.

\* \* \* \* \*

I take the liberty of recommending to you and to the members of the Philosophical Society of St. Louis, the study of the works of a philosopher who certainly will have a great future, although his doctrines in the progress of time may undergo modifications, reforms and further developments. If Hegel had lived longer, the influence of Baader upon him would have been greater yet than became visible during his last years. He has thrown Schelling out of his pantheism, and pressed him towards a semi-pantheism, or towards a deeper theism. The influence of Baader on the philosophers after Hegel—J. H. Fichte, Weisse, Sempler, C. Ph. Fischer and others—is much greater than is commonly admitted. Whether they agree to it or not, still it is a fact that Baader is the central constellation of the movement of the German spirit, from pantheism to a deeper ideal-realistic theism. Such a genius, whatever position may be taken with regard to him, cannot be left unnoticed, without running the risk of being left behind the times. I ask nothing for Baader, but to follow the maxim—"Try all and keep the best." I regret that so great a distance prevents me from sending your honorable Society some of my explanatory writings, which are admitted to be clear and thorough. It may suffice if I add a copy of my prospectus; and let me here remark, that a collection of my writings, in four large volumes, will be published by

Deichert, in Erlangen. The first volume, perhaps, will be ready at Easter, 1867.

Erdmann, in his elements of the history of philosophy, has treated of the doctrines of Baader, too briefly it is true, but with more justice than he has used in his former work on the history of modern philosophy, and he bears witness that his esteem of Baader increases more and more. But he evidently assigns to him a wrong position, by considering Oken and Baader as extremes, and Hegel as the mean, while Oken and Hegel are the extremes, and Baader the mean. The most important phenomenon in the school of Hegel is the *Idee der Wissenschaft* of Rosenkranz, (*Logik und Metaphysik*), which represents Hegel in a sense not far distant from the standpoint of Baader. \* \* \*

\* \* \* C. H. Fischer's Characteristics of Baader's Theosophy speaks with high favor of him, but still I have to take several exceptions. According to my opinion, all the authors by him referred to, as Schelling, Hegel, Schleiermacher, Dauber and Baader, we must call theosophers—or call none of them so, but *philosophers*, in order to avoid misunderstanding. Then I do not see how Schelling can be called the "most genial philosopher of modern times," and yet Baader the more, yea, the *most* profound. Finally, a want of system must be admitted, but too great importance is attributed to this. If, however, systematism could decide here, then not Schelling but Hegel is the greatest philosopher of modern times. At all events Fischer's Memorial at the Centennial Birthday of Baader is significant, and is written with great spirit and warmth. The most important work of C. Ph. Fischer, bearing on this subject, is his elements of the system of philosophy, or *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. This is one of the most important of the works of the philosophers after Hegel and Baader. The Athenäum of Froschhammer, (*Journal for Philosophy*), appeared only for three years. It had to cease its publication, because on the one side the Ultramontanist party agitated against it, and on the other side it met with insufficient support. Its reissue would be desirable, but just now not practicable, for want of interest on the part of the public, although it could bear comparison with any other philosophical journal.

Here let me say, that from Baader there proceeded a strong impulse toward the revival of the study of the long-forgotten spiritual treasures of the mystics and theosophers of the middle ages, and of the time of the Reformation. From this impulse monographs have made their appearance about Scotus Erigena, Albertus Mag-

nus—at least biographies of them—Thomas Aquinas, Meister Eckhart, Tauler, Nicholas Cusanus, Weigel, J. Böhme, Oettinger, etc. The most important of these I deem to be *Scotus Erigena*, by Joh. Huber, Christlieb and Kaulich; *Meister Eckhart*, by Bach, and *J. Böhme*, by J. Hamberger. Bach on *Eckhart* is especially instructive with respect to the connection between modern philosophy and the theosophy of Eckhart and his school, to which also Nicholas Cusanus belonged.

I presume that it will yet be discovered that Copernicus was at least acquainted with Nicholas Cusanus, if he did not even sympathize with his philosophy. The director of the observatory at Krakau, Kerlinski, is at present preparing a monograph on Copernicus, which will probably throw light on this subject. Prowe's

pamphlet on Copernicus, which I have noticed in *Glaser's* journal, refers to the investigations of Kerlinski, who has recently published a beautiful edition of the works of Copernicus. As in the early ages, first in the Pythagorean school, they approached the true doctrine of the Universe, so in the middle ages it appears in the school of Eckhart, for in a certain sense, and with some restriction, Nicholas Cusanus was the precursor of Copernicus.

I beg you, my dear sir, to communicate this letter to your honorable Society: should you see fit to publish it in a journal, you are at liberty to do so.

I remain, Sir, with great respect,

Truly, yours,

DR. FRANZ HOFFMANN,

*Prof. of Philos. at the University of Wurzburg.*

## IN THE QUARRY.

By A. C. B.

Impatient, stung with pain, and long delay,  
I chid the rough-hewn stone that round me lay;  
I said—"What shelter art thou from the heat?  
What rest art thou for tired and way-worn feet?  
What beauty hast thou for the longing eye?  
Thou nothing hast my need to satisfy!"  
And then the patient stone fit answer made—  
"Most true I am no roof with welcome shade;  
I am no house for rest, or full delight  
Of sculptured beauty for the weary sight;  
Yet am I still, material for all;  
Use me as such—I answer to thy call.  
Nay, tread me only under elimbing feet,  
So serve I thee, my destiny complete;  
Mount by me into purer, freer air,  
And find the roof that archeth everywhere;  
So what but failure seems, shall build success;  
For all, as possible, thou dost possess."

Who by the Universal squares his life,  
Sees but success in all its finite strife;  
In all that is, his truth-enlightened eyes  
Detect the May-be through its thin disguise;  
And in the Absolute's unclouded sun,  
To him the two already are the one.